Responses to Questions

REGARDING REQUEST FOR PROPOSAL
FOR
Bollinger Canyon and Crow Canyon Road Corridor
Traffic Signal System Upgrade Project
(CIP 5457)

1) **Q:** Is there any information on the available budget for this project that can be shared with the potential vendors responding to this RFP?

A: The grant funding information is public information and is posted on the Caltrans Traffic Light Synchronization Program (TLSP) and Bay Area Air Quality Management District's (BAAQMD) websites. The total grant funding for this project is $1,144,150. Of this, $785,000 is from Proposition 1B TLSP financing, the remainder is from the BAAQMD Traffic Fund for Clean Air (TFCA).

2) **Q:** Article 1.2(2) of the Sample Contract makes reference to the following documents that will be incorporated into the agreement. Please provide the following documents for our review:

c. Exhibit C - Performance Bond
d. Exhibit D - Payment Bond
e. Exhibit E - Insurance Requirements, and certificates and endorsements
f. Exhibit F - General and/or Automobile Liability Additional Insured Endorsement;
g. Exhibit G - Worker's Compensation Certification;
j. Exhibit J - Consent of Surety to Release of Retention and Final Payment
(3) General Conditions (Section 00700)

A: These documents have been posted on City of San Ramon Engineering Services FTP Site. The username and password to access this information has been emailed to all proposers separately.

3) **Q:** Please clarify the submission requirements for the Proposals. Page 7 of the RFP states that we should provide an original and three (3) copies, while page 15 states and original and four (4) copies.

A: Addendum #2 Revision #2 requires 4 copies.

4) **Q:** Is all of the existing detection functioning?

A: City staff is not aware of any malfunctioning equipment. Proposers should assume that all existing detection systems are functioning properly.

5) **Q:** If not, what units are not working and what is the proposer's responsibility to fix those units (assuming their current placement is acceptable for system operation)?

A: The Vendor/Contractor is NOT responsible for repairing or replacing existing malfunctioning detector units unless the damage or malfunction is the direct result of

Vendor/Contractor's actions. Units not installed by the Vendor/Contractor are not subject to warranty or maintenance by the Vendor/Contractor.

6) **Q:** For the locations in Table 1 that are shown to have 6'x35' loops is the loop layout consistent with the City's standard details (3 – 6' loops with 10' spacing as shown on sheet T-5B)

A: No. Most existing stop bar loops for through lanes are 6' X 35' quadrupole type. Most existing stop bar loops for left-turn lanes are 6' X 50' quadrupole type. The City recently began using the Type E detector loop configuration as shown on the Standard Details. This configuration was used on Crow Canyon Road at the Camino Ramon and Crow Canyon Place intersections. Also, signal plans within the project limits are now available for proposers at City of San Ramon Engineering Services FTP Site.

7) **Q:** The City details show that for the loop detectors each loop detector has a separate lead-in cable back to the controller cabinet. Is this correct?

RESPONSE PENDING VERIFICATION BY CITY'S MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT.

8) **Q:** For intersections with video detection can plans be provided showing the location of the detection equipment for each approach and cable path back to the controller?

RESPONSE PENDING VERIFICATION BY CITY'S MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT.

9) **Q:** Can details of the communications cable network be provided including cable size, channel assignments, number of pairs, etc?

A: All available project plans within the project limits are available for proposers' review at City of San Ramon Engineering Services FTP Site.

10) **Q:** Please clarify the maintenance period. Section 5.2.10 of the RFP; Task 10 System Maintenance makes reference to a "15-year maintenance program", and then later it refers to a "three year maintenance program period".

A: Addendum # 2, Revision #7 contains language revisions distinguishing between a "15-year Useful Life Maintenance Program" and a 3-year Troubleshooting Maintenance Service Period. Background and discussion of these items is provided below.

The City is required under the conditions of the Traffic Light Synchronization Program grant funding to meet the following maintenance criterion: "The useful life of a TLSP project shall not be less than the required useful life for capital assets pursuant to the State General Obligation Bond Law, specifically subdivision (a) of Section 16727 of the Government Code. That section generally requires that projects have an expected useful life of 15 years or more. The corridor system management plan discussed in Section 5 should include the actions necessary to maintain and operate the facility to ensure this minimum useful life."

Accordingly, Addendum #2 requires two maintenance programs as follows:

1. 15-Year "Useful Life" Maintenance Program:

This program shall include any system updates and/or modifications necessary to maintain system operability over the required 15-year "Useful Life" period. This program should not include warranties, upgrades, new releases, or major system enhancements. It should include any software updates that may be what the Vendor/Contractor anticipates will be required over the next 15 years to keep the system functioning, excluding routine maintenance.

2. 3-Year System Troubleshooting Maintenance Service Program

The maintenance period described in Task 10, Section 5.2.10 will be considered to be the 3-Year System Troubleshooting Maintenance Service Program.

11) **Q:** Can the City provide the native electronic files (e.g. MS Word, MS Excel) for the Cost Proposal Form, the ATMS Functional Requirements?

A: These documents have been posted to the City of San Ramon Engineering Services FTP Site. Please note that the Cost Proposal Form has been revised by Addendum #2, Revision #9. (A revised cost proposal has been attached to Addendum #2).

12) **Q:** What is the internet access via MS Virtual Earth described in 7.1.2.5 used for? In what manner does the City envision the proposed ATMS system must utilize this internet access?

A: The City does not have specific goals for the new ATMS with respect to interfacing with any existing geographic imaging/information systems, or any particular Internet application. Any system capable of exploiting such technologies in order to facilitate operations, management, or otherwise improve the City's ability to deliver cost-effective and quality services is likely to receive favorable consideration.

13) **Q:** Section 7.1.2.9 Coordination with Caltrans Ramp Signals - do the Caltrans ramp signals use Time-of-Day plans? Will the plans and schedules be available?

A: Yes. The City has requested current time-of-day plans and schedules from Caltrans District 4, and will post them as soon as they are available.

14) Q: Where will the system server be located, and does the communications network infrastructure terminate in this same building?

A: For the next 2 to 5 years, the system server will be located at 3180 Crow Canyon Place, about ¼ mile south of Crow Canyon Road immediately adjacent to I-680. There is no communications network infrastructure between the server location and the nearest signal system network on Crow Canyon Road, as current communications are through dial-up telephone communications to a field master. The ultimate location will be the new City Center site at the corner of Camino Ramon and Bollinger Canyon Road. The system ultimately will have direct access from the City's traffic management center (at the City Center) to the entire network communications infrastructure.

15) **Q:** Will the server reside in a place where the City LAN can be accessed from the server?

A: Yes.

16) **Q:** What firewall software does the City currently utilize?

A: CISCO ASA-5510 adaptive security appliance.

17) **Q:** The RFP requires the proposed ATMS utilize the existing City backup system for database backup. What is this system and can the City provide operational and technical details on the system?

A: Symantec Backup Exec-To-Tape. Here is the Symantec website link: http://www.symantec.com/business/backup-exec-for-windows-servers

18) **Q:** Are all cabinets standard 332 cabinets?

A: Yes.

19) **Q:** Will the use of Sensys detection infrastructure be considered by the City as an approved detection method?

A: Yes.

20) **Q:** What is dictating the 70 working day schedule requirement?

A: The City committed to complete the project including project milestones according to a schedule that was submitted with the original grant application. The 70 working-day time frame is an estimate made by City Staff that provides the City with sufficient float to insure that important project milestones are met.

Language has been added in Revision #8 of Addendum No. 2 that provides for the following:

1. The successful vendor/contractor may submit a list of approved equipment with associated lead times for approval by the City. The Notice to Proceed will be issued after all approved materials have been acquired according to the approved lead times.

2. Proposers may comment on the feasibility of completing the project within the 70-working-day period, and may submit an alternative schedule that they consider to be more practical.

21) Need clarification regarding maintenance and warranty requirements.

a) **Q:** In several areas of the RFP warranty is discussed and varying lengths of time are used when discussing the period of the warranty. Please clarify the exact length of time required for the warranty. Is it one year, two years, or three years?

A: Please refer to Revision Nos. 4 and 7 of Addendum #2.

b) Q: Warranty's are typically provided by the manufacturer of a product to protect against defective workmanship or materials. This is different from a maintenance/service agreement which would normally cover routine maintenance and emergency repairs. Is the City requiring that the vendor will supply a manufacturer's

standard warranty, with a maintenance agreement that covers anything not covered under the warranty period, and for the duration of the warranty?

A: No. The 3-year maintenance agreement is a service agreement. Please see Revision #7 in Addendum #2. (Please see also the responses provided for Question No. 10 for supplemental information related to this question.)

c) What is the duration of the acceptance test period?

A: Please refer to Revision # 6 in Addendum #2.

Q: It appears the advance loops in each lane are tied together to form a multi-lane detector. Is that true of both the intermediate and far-advance loops?

A: Yes. This configuration is typical within the project limits.

22) **Q:** Even if tied together, does each lane's advance detector have a separate DLC to the cabinet, or only to the pull box adjacent to the loops?

RESPONSE PENDING VERIFICATION BY CITY'S MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT.

23) **Q:** If needed, is the conduit between the advance loop pull box and the cabinet of adequate size, fill ratio, and condition to pull new lead-ins from the pull box to the cabinet without new or changed conduit?

RESPONSE PENDING VERIFICATION BY CITY'S MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT.

24) **Q:** Are all existing advance loops in working order?

A: Proposers should assume that all existing detection systems are in working order. The successful Vendor/Contractor will not be required to repair or replace existing detection system components that are not functioning properly.

25) **Q:** Does the as-built configuration of all approaches at the project signals cited in the RFP follow the specific detector layout in Appendix E? If not, what detectors are available?

A: There are different layouts. Please see signal plans posted on City of San Ramon Engineering Services FTP Site.

26) **Q:** What is the detector layout for the Caltrans signals? Please specify where loops are and which are tied together, and where they are tied together.

A: Plans for most of the existing Caltrans signal systems are available on City of San Ramon Engineering Services FTP Site.

27) **Q:** What existing communications interface/infrastructure is available from the Caltrans equipment?

A: There is existing interconnect and conduit that is expected to be available for interconnection of the City's system with the Caltrans network. This has not been confirmed. Please refer to available plans on City of San Ramon Engineering Services FTP Site.

28) **Q:** Does Caltrans have interconnect cable between the two signals in each case?

A: Yes. Plans for most of the existing Caltrans signal systems are available on City of San Ramon Engineering Services FTP Site.

29) **Q:** What is "Automatic Remote Computer Update" (Functional Requirements Table, Page 41 of the RFP)?

A: This item has been deleted in Revision #12 of Addendum #2.

30) **Q:** What are the requirements for the 30 day system test?

A: This item has been deleted in Revision #12 of Addendum #2.

31) **Q:** How many dual channel loop detector cards exist in each controller cabinet?

RESPONSE PENDING VERIFICATION BY CITY'S MAINTENANCE DEPARTMENT.

32) **Q:** Section 5.2.10, Page 24 of the RFP calls for 15 years of maintenance support in two places and three years supports in another. Please clarify the desired maintenance support period.

A: Please see the responses to Question Nos.10 and 21 above.

33) **Q:** There appears to be section numbering inconsistencies in Section 7, page 30 of the RFP. Please clarify.

A: There are two sections incorrectly labeled as "Section 7.1.2.9." Revision #10 of Addendum # 2 provides a correction that revises the first of the two identically numbered sections entitled "Integration of City's Communications System" to Section 7.1.2.8. The numbering of Section 7.1.2.9 "Coordination with Caltrans Ramp Signals" remain unchanged.

34) **Q:** Please clarify the order of precedence of System Specifications and ATMS Functional Requirements.

A: The features considered to be the most important to staff were identified in the ATMS Functional Requirements were listed in the Table as "required". Others were designated as "desirable." For proposers' benefit, preparation of a table showing rankings of perceived importance of functional requirements by City Staff is being considered.

35) **Q:** RFP Section 5.2.6 - Task 6, requires that the vendor supply one (1) server, two (2) work stations, and two (2) laptop computers. However, the price sheet lists the work stations and the laptops as items to be priced as "alternate" equipment. Please clarify the discrepancy. Is there a possibility that the City may supply it's own work stations and laptops?

A: The City may choose to acquire the equipment separately. Addendum # 2 (Revision #5) revises the section to make clear that the workstations and laptop equipment are part of Alternative A in the Cost Proposal.

36) **Q:** RFP Section 5.2.4 - Task 4, requires the use of a specific wireless configuration which may not be adequate to meet the needs of the proposed system. Because the final design is not part of the RFP and must be submitted after a contract is signed, will the vendor be required to adhere to these specifications as listed in Appendix B?

A: The City encourages innovation and sensible utilization of available technological advances. If City equipment specifications or provisions of this RFP are seen by any Proposer as obstructing innovative design, or otherwise inhibiting the deployment of a safe, efficient, and cost-effective ATMS, Proposers are encouraged to substitute system components, or make other modifications as they deem necessary to deliver the highest possible quality and efficiency. Any such changes or substitutions shall be clearly documented, along with the reasons for the substitutions and/or modifications.

37) **Q:** The RFP in general (including section 5, and Appendix B) and the appendices require the use of in-ground loop detectors, or video detectors to be used with the adaptive signal control system. Will the City permit the use of alternative vehicle detection technologies?

A: Yes, depending upon proposed system—see also Question No. 19 above.

38) **Q:** Regarding Task 10 – System Maintenance, please clarify the maintenance services to be provided by the Proposer. Will the proposer be responsible for maintenance of all items in the traffic controller cabinet, even if existing City-equipment is used, or is Proposer only responsible for maintenance of equipment they provide? As an example, is it the City's expectation that the Proposer would be first response for issues such as failed load switches or build burn-outs that cause an intersection to go to flash, or would City provide first line of response?

A: This topic was generally addressed with responses to Question Nos. 10 and 21 and Addendum #2. Vendor/Contractor will be responsible to maintain and repair under warranty all items furnished and installed as part of the project only. City maintenance staff provides first response for emergency maintenance issues.

39) **Q:** Detection is another are that needs to be defined. What level of responsibility will proposer have for existing detection equipment that is used with the new system? Specific maintenance responsibilities would be beneficial to allow Proposer's to estimate the expected level of effort.

A: The City prefers that existing detection equipment be used to the greatest extent possible for the project. Existing detection, even though used by the new system, will remain the responsibility of the City, unless damaged by the Vendor/Contractor.

40) **Q:** What is the location of where the central hardware (servers will be located)? Is there conduit between this location and the City's conduit and cable network for the two corridors?

A: Please see the response to Question #14.

41) **Q:** In order to provide communications connectivity between the corridors and the central hardware will the City allow for the use of leased services (e.g. DSL)? If leased services are proposed will the City be responsible for the installation and monthly usage fees?

A: Yes. Leased services and monthly usage fees will be paid by the City.

42) **Q:** Regarding Section 7.1.2.5, please clarify the City's intent for internet access. Is the intent that the system will access the internet to download information, or that the system is capable of exporting data to an internet application such as a traveler information web site.

A: Please see the response to Question #12.

43) **Q:** Regarding the coordination with the Caltrans intersections, please clarify the City's expectations. Is it the City's desire that these intersections will be fully integrated with the planned traffic management system, or will the intersections remain under Caltrans control and the operation of the new traffic management system just be coordinated with these intersections? If the expectation is for the intersections to be fully integrated please provide information on phasing and detection. In addition, please confirm that Proposer will be allowed to change the controllers and/or firmware so as to support the integration of the intersections.

A: Coordination with Caltrans' signals is a desirable project goal, however, it is subject to limitations based on stated policies from District 4 officials. The City's preferred alternatives for ramp signal control, in order of preference, are listed below with comments:

Option 1: City assumes full unlimited control of ramp signals

Under this option, the City would operate and maintain all ramp signals as part of the existing City traffic signal system. According to District 4 officials, this option is extremely unlikely.

Option 2: City assumes limited and/or conditional control of ramp signals

Under this option, the City would operate and maintain ramp signals under agreement and within parameters set by District 4. Full control may be granted during certain hours and under certain conditions. According to District 4 officials, this option is unlikely.

Option 3: City System Synchronizes with Caltrans System through common time-of-day coordination/controller clock synchronization

Under this option, the City would maintain synchronization through maintenance of synchronized time-of-day plans and controller clocks to the greatest extent possible. District 4 officials have coordinated with other local agencies in the area and agreements for limited synchronization have been reached and are currently in operation.

Further coordination with Caltrans will finalize the disposition of the Caltrans traffic signals with respect to the project. Final resolution of this issue is expected during the design phase. All available ramp signal plans have been posted on City of San Ramon Engineering Services FTP Site.

44) **Q:** Can the City provide lane geometry and phasing diagrams for the intersections? Alternatively, a current SYNCHRO file would also be useful.

A: Current SYNCHRO files for both the Crow Canyon Road and Bollinger Canyon Road corridors have been posted at City of San Ramon Engineering Services FTP Site.